



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/881,225	06/12/2001	Tomasz J. Goldman	08204/0203162-US0	7562
38878	7590	09/30/2008		
FS Networks, Inc. c/o DARBY & DARBY P.C. P.O. BOX 770 Church Street Station NEW YORK, NY 10008-0770				
EXAMINER				
BHATIA, AJAY M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2145				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/30/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/881,225

Applicant(s)

GOLDMAN ET AL.

Examiner

AJAY BHATIA

Art Unit

2145

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 July 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- 7) ☐ Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see remarks, filed 7/21/2008, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-20 under 102 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Burton.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-8, 10-11, 13-14, and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Burton et al. (United States Patent 6,947,991).

For claim 1, Burton teaches, a method comprising:

detecting attachment of a shared resource to a server; (Burton, Col. 7 lines 5-30, new object)

automatically querying if the shared resource is associated with a share indicator stored at the shared resource; (Burton, Col. 7 lines 5-30, new object)

applying share allocation defined by the share indicator if the share indicator is present at the shared resource; (Burton, Col. 5 line 56 to Col. 6 line 5, authorization)

and if the share indicator is stored separate from the shared resource automatically creating a share file for the share indicator at the server that enables identification of the shared resource, and automatically allocating sharing of the shared resource. (Burton, Col. 7 lines 5-30, new object, Col. 4 lines 10-15, printer object, Col. 8 lines 15-26, default)

For claim 2, Burton teaches, the method of Claim 1 wherein querying further comprises: determining if a share directory is present on the shared resource; (Burton, Col. 4 lines 46-54, directory)

and determining if a share file is in the share directory. (Burton, Col. 4 lines 46-54, directory)

For claim 4, Burton teaches, the method of Claim 1 further comprising: creating a share indicator on the shared resource if the share indicator is not present. (Burton, Col. 7 lines 5-30, new object, create)

For claim 5, Burton teaches, the method of Claim 4 wherein creating comprises: creating a share directory on the shared resource; (Burton, Col. 7 lines 5-30, new object,)

and creating a share file in the share directory. (Burton, Col. 7 lines 5-30, new object, Col. 4 lines 46-54, directory)

For claim 7, Burton teaches, a computer readable storage media containing executable computer program instructions which when executed cause a digital processing system to perform a method comprising:

detecting attachment of a shared resource to a server; (Burton, Col. 7 lines 5-30, new object)

automatically querying if the shared resource is associated with a share indicator stored at the shared resource; (Burton, Col. 7 lines 5-30, new object)

applying share allocation defined by the share indicator if the share indicator is present at the shared resource; (Burton, Col. 5 line 56 to Col. 6 line 5, authorization)

and if the share indicator is stored separate from the shared resource automatically creating a share file for the share indicator at the server that enables identification of the shared resource, and automatically allocating sharing of the shared resource. (Burton, Col. 7 lines 5-30, new object, Col. 4 lines 10-15, printer object, Col. 8 lines 15-26, default)

For claim 8, Burton teaches, the computer readable storage media of Claim 7 which when executed cause a digital processing system to perform a method further comprising:

determining if a share directory is present on the shared resource; (Burton, Col. 4 lines 46-54, directory)

and determining if a share file is in the share directory. (Burton, Col. 4 lines 46-54, directory)

For claim 10, Burton teaches, the computer readable storage media of Claim 7 which when executed cause a digital processing system to perform a method further comprising:

creating a share indicator on the shared resource if the share indicator is not present. (Burton, Col. 7 lines 5-30, new object, XML doc)

For claim 11, Burton teaches, the computer readable storage media of Claim 10 which when executed cause a digital processing system to perform a method further comprising:

creating a share directory on the shared resource; (Burton, Col. 7 lines 5-30, object,)

and creating a share file in the share directory. (Burton, Col. 4 lines 46-54, directory)

For claim 13, (teaches) a system comprising:

a processor; (Burton,)

a non-volatile storage unit coupled to the processor, the non-volatile storage unit to store a descriptor table having an entry identifying share allocation for a known

storage free device; (Burton, Col. 7 lines 5-30, new object, Col. 4 lines 10-15, printer object)

and a memory coupled to the processor to store a shared resource table to identify share allocation of shared devices coupled to the system, wherein if an unknown storage free device is coupled to the system, the processor automatically creates a share file in the shared resource table that enables identification and automatically allocates sharing of the unknown storage free device. (Burton, Col. 7 lines 5-30, new object, Col. 4 lines 10-15, printer object, Col. 8 lines 15-26, default)

For claim 14, Burton teaches, the system of Claim 13 further comprising:
a writable shared resource coupled to the processor, the writable shared resource containing a share directory. (Burton, Col. 4 lines 46-54, directory)

For claim 17, Burton teaches, the system of Claim 13 further comprising:
a read only shared resource wherein the processor detects connection of the a read only shared resource and automatically adds an entry to the descriptor table responsive to the connection. (Burton, Col. 7 lines 5-30, new object, Col. 4 lines 10-15, printer object)

For claim 18, Burton teaches, the system of Claim 13 further comprising:

a writable shared resource wherein the processor detects connection of the writable shared resource and automatically adds an entry to the shared resources table responsive to the connection. (Burton, Col. 4 lines 46-54, directory)

For claim 19. (Currently amended) A method comprising:

maintaining a descriptor table on a server in a non-volatile memory for a plurality of known devices; (Burton, Col. 7 lines 5-30, XML doc)

detecting attachment of a device to the server; (Burton, Col. 7 lines 5-30, new object)

determining if the device is one of the plurality of known devices; (Burton, Col. 7 lines 5-30, new object, Col. 4 lines 10-15, printer object)

applying a share allocation from the descriptor table upon attachment if the device is one of the plurality of known devices; (Burton, Col. 5 line 56 to Col. 6 line 5, authorization)

and if the device is determined to be an unknown device, automatically creating a share indicator on the unknown device and a corresponding share entry in the descriptor table that enables identification and automatically allocating sharing of the unknown device. (Burton, Col. 7 lines 5-30, new object, Col. 8 lines 15-26, default)

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3, 6, 9, 12 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burton et al. (United States Patent 6,947,991) in view of Blumenau et al. (U.S. Patent 6,665,714) referred to as Blumenau-2.

For claim 3, Burton fails to clearly disclose a checksum

Blumenau-2 teaches, the method of Claim 2 wherein queuing further comprises; determining if a checksum file exists in the share directory; (Blumenau-2, Col. 6 lines 42-61)

and validating a checksum in the checksum file. (Blumenau-2, Col. 16 lines 28-40)

Burton and Blumenau-2, are compatible, Burton operates with different products (Burton, Col. 5 lines 20-30)

Burton and Blumenau-2, are both in the field of sharing of resources

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine Burton and Blumenau-2, because Blumenau-2 the addition of a checksum would insure security and make sure data is not corrupt (Blumenau-2, Col. 16 line 21)

Burton and Blumenau-2, are compatible, Burton operates with different products (Burton, Col. 5 lines 20-30)

Burton and Blumenau-2, are both in the field of sharing of resources

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine Burton and Blumenau-2, because Blumenau-2 the addition of a checksum would insure security and make sure data is not corrupt (Blumenau-2, Col. 16 line 21)

For claim 6, Burton fails to clearly disclose a checksum

Blumenau-2 teaches, the method of Claim 5 wherein creating further comprises: creating a checksum file in the share directory; (Blumenau-2, Col. 6 lines 42-61, Col. 16 lines 28-40)

and writing a checksum in the checksum file. (Blumenau-2, Col. 6 lines 42-61, Col. 16 lines 28-40)

Burton and Blumenau-2, are compatible, Burton operates with different products
(Burton, Col. 5 lines 20-30)

Burton and Blumenau-2, are both in the field of sharing of resources

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine Burton and Blumenau-2, because Blumenau-2 the addition of a checksum would insure security and make sure data is not corrupt
(Blumenau-2, Col. 16 line 21)

For claim 9, Burton fails to clearly disclose a checksum

Blumenau-2 teaches, the computer readable storage media of Claim 8 which when executed cause a digital processing system to perform a method further comprising: determining if a checksum file exists in the share directory; (Blumenau-2, Col. 6 lines 42-61, Col. 16 lines 28-40)

and validating a checksum in the checksum file. (Blumenau-2, Col. 6 lines 42-61, Col. 16 lines 28-40)

Burton and Blumenau-2, are compatible, Burton operates with different products
(Burton, Col. 5 lines 20-30)

Burton and Blumenau-2, are both in the field of sharing of resources

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine Burton and Blumenau-2, because Blumenau-2 the addition of a checksum would insure security and make sure data is not corrupt (Blumenau-2, Col. 16 line 21)

For claim 12, Burton fails to clearly disclose a checksum

Blumenau-2 teaches, the computer readable storage media of Claim 11 which when executed cause a digital processing system to perform a method further comprising: creating a checksum file in the share directory; (Blumenau-2, Col. 6 lines 42-61, Col. 16 lines 28-40)

and writing a checksum in the checksum file. (Blumenau-2, Col. 6 lines 42-61, Col. 16 lines 28-40)

Burton and Blumenau-2, are compatible, Burton operates with different products (Burton, Col. 5 lines 20-30)

Burton and Blumenau-2, are both in the field of sharing of resources

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine Burton and Blumenau-2, because Blumenau-2 the addition of a checksum would insure security and make sure data is not corrupt (Blumenau-2, Col. 16 line 21)

For claim 15, Burton fails to clearly disclose a checksum

Blumenau-2 teaches, the system of Claim 14 wherein the share directory contains: a share file; (Blumenau-2, Col. 6 lines 42-61, Col. 16 lines 28-40)

and a check sum file. (Burton, Blumenau-2, Col. 6 lines 42-61, Col. 16 lines 28-40)

Burton and Blumenau-2, are compatible, Burton operates with different products (Burton, Col. 5 lines 20-30)

Burton and Blumenau-2, are both in the field of sharing of resources

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine Burton and Blumenau-2, because Blumenau-2 the addition of a checksum would insure security and make sure data is not corrupt (Blumenau-2, Col. 16 line 21)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 16 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burton et al. (United States Patent 6,947,991) in view of Fisher (U.S. Patent 6,513,101).

For claim 16, Burton fails to clearly disclose, ages out

Fisher, teaches, the system of Claim 13 wherein the processor ages out the entry if the known device is not present for a period of time. (Fisher, Col. 7 lines 6-20)

Burton and Fisher are both in the field of remote storage

Burton and Fisher are compatible

It would be obvious of one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the system of Burton with the method of Fisher because Fisher describes a

storage library manger witch reduces the amount of wasted space. (Fisher, Col. 2 lines 16-20 and Col. 2 lines 40-44)

For claim 20, Burton fails to clearly disclose, ages out

Fisher. teaches, the method of Claim 19 further comprising:

aging out entries from the descriptor table after a corresponding known device has been detached for a period of time. (Fisher, Col. 7 lines 6-20)

Burton and Fisher are both in the field of remote storage

Burton and Fisher are compatible

It would be obvious of one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the system of Burton with the method of Fisher because Fisher describes a storage library manger witch reduces the amount of wasted space. (Fisher, Col. 2 lines 16-20 and Col. 2 lines 40-44)

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See attached Notice of references cited (if appropriate).

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AJAY BHATIA whose telephone number is (571)272-3906. The examiner can normally be reached on M, T, H, F 9:00-3:30, Also please fax interview requests to 571-273-3906.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on 571-272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jason D Cardone/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2145